

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4279 of 2026

DATE: 17.04.2026

BETWEEN:

N. Murali Krishna Yadav

..... Petitioner/Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Represented by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Hyderabad, through Chilkalguda PS.

..... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-
arrest bail to the petitioner, who is arrayed as one of the accused
in Crime No.304 of 2025 before the Chilkalguda Police Station,
Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections
318(4), 336, 336(3), 340(2), 242, 61(2) read with 3(5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 19.06.2025, the *defacto* complainant, a real estate developer, lodged a complaint alleging fraud and forgery in relation to a construction project awarded by Oil and Natural Gas Corporation for development of 192 residential quarters. The complainant engaged the accused company, M/s Sannverse Railtech Pvt. Ltd., and its representatives to assist in execution of the project and executed a Special Power of Attorney in favour of Accused No.4. It is alleged that the accused acted negligently, failed to execute the work properly, and did not clear dues to vendors, causing delay and financial loss. The complainant further alleges that despite cancellation of the Special Power of Attorney on 07.08.2023, the accused fabricated a false MOU dated 09.08.2023 using forged signatures and impersonation. The said MOU was allegedly used to initiate arbitration proceedings without the knowledge or consent of the complainant. It is also alleged that the stamp paper for the MOU was fraudulently obtained and attested by a notary without proper verification. The accused are further alleged to have suppressed the change of company name and misrepresented facts during the transaction, as such requested the police for necessary action. Based on this report, the police registered a case against the accused for the above-mentioned offences.

3. Heard Sri V. T. Kalyan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent–State and Sri KVL Narasimha Murthy, learned counsel for the de-facto complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner, being the Deputy General Manager of M/s Sannverse Railtech Pvt. Ltd., is a reputed professional and has been falsely implicated in F.I.R. No.304 of 2025 arising out of a private complaint and that the petitioner played a key role in securing the tender from Oil and Natural Gas Corporation and that the parties had entered into valid agreements, including a Special Power of Attorney and MOU dated 09.08.2023, which has been upheld by the Arbitral Tribunal. He further submitted that the alleged revocation of the Special Power of Attorney is invalid in law and the allegations of forgery are baseless and that the dispute is purely civil and commercial in nature, arising out of contractual obligations, and is already pending before the Arbitral Tribunal, and thus the criminal proceedings are an abuse of process. He contended that the complainant itself breached contractual terms by withholding payments and unlawfully terminating the MOU, despite substantial work being executed by the petitioner and all

documents are in the custody of the prosecution, the petitioner has cooperated with the investigation, and there is no risk of absconding or tampering with evidence. Hence, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner by allowing the present Criminal Petition.

5. Learned counsel for the *de facto* complainant submitted that despite furnishing all necessary documents and cooperating with the investigation, the police have not made substantial progress and have failed to disclose the status of the investigation and the earlier attempts by the accused to quash the proceedings before the High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court were dismissed, thereby permitting continuation of investigation. He further submitted that the accused persons, in conspiracy, fabricated documents and initiated arbitration proceedings involving huge monetary claims to defraud the complainant and that the police have not taken effective action against the key accused, thereby necessitating intervention. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, contending that complaint discloses a well-planned criminal conspiracy involving fabrication of a false MOU dated 09.08.2023,

impersonation, and fraudulent use of stamp papers, to unlawfully claim huge amounts from the complainant in relation to the project awarded by Oil and Natural Gas Corporation and that the investigation has revealed existence of two MOUs, and scientific evidence and witness statements clearly establish that the disputed MOU is forged and could not have been executed as claimed. He further submitted the petitioner played a central and active role in the fabrication, procurement of stamp papers, and use of the forged document in arbitration proceedings to claim nearly Rs.447 crores, thereby attracting serious offences including forgery for the purpose of cheating, as such the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, that the investigation is at a nascent stage, and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation. Accordingly, he prayed for dismissal of the Criminal Petition.

7. In light of the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is noted that the petitioner is arrayed as Accused No.3. While considering the anticipatory bail petition, this Court has to examine whether custodial interrogation is necessary for the purpose of investigation. As seen from the record, the dispute primarily arises

out of execution of MOUs and subsequent arbitration proceedings relating to the project awarded by Oil and Natural Gas Corporation, and the allegations are largely based on documentary evidence. It is also evident that the petitioner has already appeared before the Investigating Officer pursuant to notices issued and has cooperated with the investigation. Considering the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, and the fact that the case revolves around documentary evidence, this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted at this stage and deems it appropriate to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Chilkalguda Police Station, Hyderabad within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Court shall release him on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioner shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.
- iii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Wednesday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m. for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier,

for the purpose of investigation, and
thereafter, as and when required.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand
closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 17.04.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4279 of 2026

Date: 17.04.2026
SS